REMARKS

By the above actions, claim 14 has been amended. In view of these actions and the following remarks, further consideration of this application is requested.

Claims 14-26 & 28 were rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, written description requirement. However, the language which formed the basis for this rejection has been removed from claim 14 and replaced by language acknowledged by the Examiner to be supported by the specification. In this regard, in addition to the portion of page 11 cited by the Examiner, the Examiner's attention is directed to the last paragraph of page 7 of the substitute specification filed January 26, 2006 which reads:

In principle, however, it is also possible for a plurality of display devices to be disposed separately from one another in several rooms or in different locations. For example, in a first room, a viewer can view a first sequence of a film at time t_1 and a second sequence of the film in a second room at time t_2 . In this case, the difference in time between the playing time of the first sequence and that of the second sequence can preferably be precisely adjusted to the average period of time that it takes the viewer to walk from the first room to the second room. Thus, in spite of the different rooms, the viewer will see a seemingly continuous sequence of the film.

As a result, amended claim 14 is fully supported by the specification in a such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors were in possession of the claimed invention at the time that the application was filed, so that withdrawal of this rejection is in order and action to that effect is requested.

Claims 14-19, 24-26 & 28 were rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over the Muoio patent while claims 20-23 were rejected as being unpatentable over the Muoio patent when viewed in combination with the Amo patent, these rejections having been made without regard to the features of the invention defined by the language that the Examiner considered to be unsupported by the specification. However, with the new language that replaced that ignored by the Examiner, based on the Examiner's comments, it is clear that the prior art does not teach the present invention as now claimed.

In particular, as noted in the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, the Examiner has tacitly acknowledged that, because the same playlist is playing at the same time in the two rooms in accordance with Muoio's teaching, a portion of the sequence would be

Application No. 10/566,186 Docket No. 740116-871

- 7 -

missed by viewer travelling between rooms. Instead, it was the Examiner's position that the claim as rejected (without the problematic language) did not preclude missing of a portion of the sequence. However, since this is not the case for claim 14 as now presented, it should now be clear that amended claim 14 is patentably unobvious from the teachings of Muoio. As for Amo, this reference is cited for unrelated aspects of the present invention and contains no disclosure of this distinguishing characteristic of the present invention by which it is possible for a person travelling from room to room to see substantially the entire sequence of the playlist. Accordingly, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections under § 103 is in order and is hereby requested.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, in the absence of new and more relevant prior art being found, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and action to that effect is requested. However, while it is believed that this application should now be in condition for allowance, in the event that any issues should remain, or an new issues arise, after consideration of this response which could be addressed through discussions with the undersigned, then the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone for the purpose of resolving any such issue and thereby facilitating approval of this application without further delay.

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Safran

Registration No. 27,997

Roberts Mlotkowski Safran & Cole, P.C. PO Box 10064 McLean, VA 22102

Direct Telephone: 703-584-3273

DSS:kmm